

Central Washington University ScholarWorks@CWU

All Master's Theses


Master's Theses

1967

An Investigation of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Certain Aspects of the High School Principal's Role

William Douglas Garrison
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Garrison, William Douglas, "An Investigation of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Certain Aspects of the High School Principal's Role" (1967). *All Master's Theses*. 685.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/685>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

AN INVESTIGATION OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES
TOWARD CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE
HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL'S ROLE

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
William Douglas Garrison
December, 1967

LD
5771.3
G242i

CWSC
Archives

CONFIDENTIAL

.....

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

.....

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

.....

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

E. E. Samuelson, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Frank Price

C. H. Potter

LD
5771.3

G242i

SPECIAL
COLLECTION

157666

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED . . .	1
The Problem	2
Statement of the problem	2
Definitions of Terms Used	6
Scope and Limitations of the Study	6
Scope	6
Limitations of the study	9
Hypotheses	9
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Specific Surveys	14
General Needs	16
Summary	19
III. PLAN OF RESEARCH	20
The Questionnaire	20
Classification of Questions	22
The Research Population	22
Additional Facts About the Population	23
IV. DISCUSSION OF THE DATA	24
Group I--Democratic Attitudes	24
Democratic-autocratic choice (Subgroup A)	24
Extent of participation (Subgroup B)	26

CHAPTER	PAGE
Group II: Teachers' Expectations About Principals' Attitudes	30
Group III: The Current Behavior of Principals	35
Group IV: The Influence of the Principal's Position in Lay Society	39
Group V: General Attitudes	41
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	44
BIBLIOGRAPHY	48
APPENDIX. Questionnaire	50

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Responses of Teachers to Democratic-Autocratic Choice of Questions (Group I-A)	25
II. Responses of Teachers to the Extent of Participation Questions (Group I-B)	28
III. Responses of Teachers to Teachers' Expectations About Principals' Attitudes Questions (Group II)	31
IV. Responses of Teachers to the Principals' Current Behavior Questions (Group III)	36
V. Responses of Teachers to the Influence of Outside Honors Questions (Group IV)	40
VI. Responses of Teachers to the General Attitudes Questions (Group V)	42

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

High quality public schools are important to modern American society. Recent study indicates that high morale in a teaching staff is closely associated with high quality education (8:159). If this is true, then the results of research by Charles Bidwell are quite important. He found that teachers are satisfied when their administrators' actions are perceived as being consistent with the teachers' expectations. When the actions and the expectations were perceived as being inconsistent, the teachers were dissatisfied (3:47).

How well a principal measures up to the teachers' ideas about what a principal should be, how well he as the most immediate educational leader fulfills the individual teacher's hopes and expectations, may be vital to a principal's success in improving his school. For if a principal acts in such a way that he unknowingly offends the deep conceptions or convictions of a teacher, he may, effectively, lose that teacher as an ally in achieving his major goal, raising the quality of education in our schools. The material gathered in this thesis may be useful to an administrator concerned about improving faculty morale.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. This study attempts to determine certain aspects of the roles that teachers expect and desire administrators to play. The following studies suggest that correct information about teachers' expectations may be useful to an administrator.

Howard Becker, studying the authority system in the public schools, reached a conclusion similar to Bidwell's (above):

The principal is accepted as the supreme authority in the school . . . But this acceptance of inferiority has limits. Teachers have a well-developed conception of just how and toward what ends the principal's authority should be used, and conflict arises when it is used without regard for the teachers' expectations (2:133-134).

Therefore, teachers' attitudes should be determined so that administrators can take these attitudes into account when they make decisions.

Some administrators do not seem to have reliable information about their teachers' attitudes. Indirect evidence on the question is provided by Paul Hedlund and Foster Brown. They found that 33 per cent of the teachers studied felt "working conditions do not encourage the teacher to improve the quality of his work." Ten per cent of the teachers wanted to leave their positions because of these conditions (10:41). E. C. Hunter found a similar situation

in New Orleans. When asked, "Are you encouraged to grow in proficiency and increase your skill as a teacher?" 25 per cent said "no" and 7 per cent were uncertain (11:349). Almost one-third of the teachers could not say they were being encouraged to be better teachers. When asked, "Are you recognized and rewarded for exceptional services to the school and community?" only 42 per cent of the teachers said "yes."

Additional evidence is provided by a survey by the National Education Association. Eleven per cent of the teachers did not fully approve curricular experiments with which they were involved at the time of the survey (16:24). Another 16 per cent of the teachers reserved comment, suggesting that many administrators are not sensitive to the needs of the teachers and may not be aware of teacher needs and attitudes.

One may ask, what reliable source of information on teacher opinions is available to an administrator? He can (1) define his own position and assume that teachers share his viewpoint; (2) use the ordinary channels of communication in the school; or (3) examine the professional literature.

With respect to the first source, Bartholomew Wall studied the attitudes of administrators, specialists, and teachers toward the profession, toward their professional

peers, toward children, and toward education as a community agency by distributing a questionnaire to ninety professionals in Wayne County, Michigan. He reported:

The major finding is that statistically significant attitudinal differences exist among the mentioned specialists, administrators and teachers The teachers appear to be more authoritarian, conservative and traditional than either the administrators or the specialists (18:117).

This study and others like it, e.g., Arthur Blumberg's (4) and Robert S. Miller's (13), indicate that a principal cannot presume to know teachers' opinions merely by defining his own views.

Nor can administrators be confident of receiving the necessary information directly from the teachers through ordinary channels. Forty-four per cent of the teachers studied by Glen Rasmussen, for example, made large errors in their interpretations of their principals' ideals (17:5-6). Sixteen per cent of the teachers bluntly blamed an "unsympathetic administration" for their failure to achieve their teaching ideals (17:4).

If the teachers are not receiving accurate information (according to Rasmussen's results they are not), then the administrators will probably not be receiving adequate information either. A similar conclusion is suggested by the results of an investigation by Dwight Arnold (1). In studying the opinions of teachers and principals on aspects

of group planning, he asked the participants to indicate the extent of certain practices in their schools. The rating scale was:

5 - very often, 75 times out of 100

4 - often, 50 times out of 100

3 - sometimes, 25 times out of 100

2 - seldom, 10 times out of 100

1 - never, zero times out of 100 (1:203)

On the item "the leader is sensitive to members' feelings," the principals' rating was 4.3; the teachers' rating was 3.8. On the item "the leader actually seeks critical comments from members," the principals' rating was 4.1; the teachers' rating was only 3.4. On the item "the leader makes it easy for the members to talk to him," the principals' rating was 4.6; the teachers rated it only 4.1 (1:206). (4.1 means about half the time.) Arnold said, "The widest disagreements between teachers and principals were on items concerning interchange of thinking, especially when it involved possible criticism" (1:207).

Apparently the lines of communication are not always functioning adequately. It seems that some principals cannot determine teachers' views either by introspection or from communication through the schools' ordinary channels.

Administrators have only one other source of information about teachers' opinions, the professional literature.

Unfortunately, little research is available on the topic. This issue is considered in detail in Chapter II.

With all three sources of administrators' information limited in reliability, a need is presented for research in the field of teacher opinion, research that can assist administrators in their task of improving teacher morale.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

For the purposes of this study, teacher means only personnel who have a full-time teaching assignment and who are included in the population described on page six under the heading "Scope of the Study." Administrator means only "building principal." Teachers were not asked to comment upon the roles of supervisors or superintendents. Innovation means a procedure that is new to the teacher or the school using it.

III. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Scope. This investigation is based on a questionnaire distributed to selected students enrolled in the summer session of Central Washington State College and living in or near Ellensburg, Washington, during the last week of July, 1966. The population includes only those teachers meeting the conditions specified above who were 26 years of age or younger, who had one to three years of teaching experience, and who taught in grades 10 to 12 during the preceding year.

The characteristics of the population were chosen to balance several factors. First, some attempt to reduce the variability of the population was appropriate. Daniel E. Griffiths has commented about teacher opinion surveys: "Most studies fail to differentiate among the respondents One study which did differentiate arrived at some radically different conclusions" (8:160). Second, to be useful to principals, the teachers who have the characteristics of the research population should be easy to identify. Classification by intelligence test results or other specialized information not commonly available to principals was therefore inadvisable. Third, the characteristics should be sufficiently restrictive to offer the promise that the population may share common attitudes, yet not be so restrictive as to reduce the population to an unreasonably small size. Fourth, data must be obtained from the largest possible fraction of the population. Deobald B. Van Dalen states that, "Partial returns can introduce a bias that will render the obtained data useless missing data might substantially change the findings of the study (19:255). This factor made it advisable to study only one specific population. That is, the population was not to be divided, for example, by soliciting returns from both elementary and senior high school teachers and then analyzing each group separately, for missing returns from both groups would have to be charged against each group, thereby decreasing confidence in the results for each group.

The characteristics chosen for the population seemed to balance the four factors. The reasons for choosing young, somewhat experienced senior high school teachers were as follows: Young teachers have just recently participated in the common experience of college. They have chosen teaching as their primary vocational interest, as opposed to older people (who might also be somewhat experienced) who may have been primarily interested in the military or in business and who enter teaching only after completing their careers in these other fields. They may therefore have a different orientation toward education than their older colleagues.

A year or more of total responsibility for a classroom distinguishes the slightly experienced teacher from the inexperienced teacher. The practitioner who lives teaching eight hours a day may not have the same attitudes as the hour-a-day student of education. A more homogeneous group was anticipated by excluding inexperienced teachers. Since the population included only young people, teachers with very much experience were also excluded.

The population was restricted to senior high school teachers. Teachers channel themselves into elementary, junior high, or senior high school teaching. Since their attitudes toward education are sufficiently different to induce them to take these different paths, one cannot assume that they share common attitudes toward school administration.

After the classification (of young, somewhat experienced high school teachers) was selected, the population was restricted to summer quarter State College students living in or near Ellensburg. This was done to ensure that every member of the population could be contacted. Responses from 97 per cent of the total population are included in the data.

Limitations of the study. The teachers who took part in the study are not a random sample of all the young experienced high school teachers in the state. Four other state institutions and several private colleges enroll such students. Data for only one summer is included in the survey, so the population does not represent all such students that attend Central Washington State College during other summers. (The 26:5 male-female ratio suggests that the population is not representative of summer quarter enrollment, but information is not available to test this view.) The population does present some detailed information about one group of 31 teachers, information that may be combined with similar studies in the future to obtain a comprehensive view of teachers' attitudes in Washington.

IV. HYPOTHESES

This investigation was conducted

1. to determine if teachers prefer to work in a school

that is administered according to democratic principles.

2. to determine if teachers want principals to have positive attitudes toward instructional improvement.
3. to determine if principals' current behavior maximizes instructional improvement.
4. to determine if teachers respect a principal more if he has an important position in society outside the school.
5. to determine if some general attitudes of the selected teachers are associated with any patterns of responses to other questions in the survey.

The first hypothesis derives its importance from the fact that some authors of texts on administration base their books on the premise that democracy in school administration is philosophically and practically superior to any other approach. Daniel Griffiths' book, Human Relations in School Administration (10), is an example of one such text. James A. Van Zwoll's School Personnel Administration is another (24:10, 17). Van Zwoll states that "The bona fide employment of employees in policy making, whenever that is practicable, on a voluntary basis is one hallmark of morale-boosting democratic administration" (24:175). He says that "It may generally be expected that morale will be low under

an oppressively autocratic administration" (24:174), but adds that "If the autocratic administration is benevolent and paternalistic, the level of morale could be fairly high . . ." (24:174-175). The studies of Becker (2) and Bidwell (3) cited earlier in the chapter suggest that the effects of democratic, oppressive autocratic, or benevolent autocratic administration upon morale may not be the same for all faculties but instead may depend to some extent on the attitudes of the teachers involved. If this suggestion is a valid inference from their studies, then knowledge of teachers' attitudes might be important to administrators who are concerned about faculty morale. In particular it might be important to know if teachers want a democratic school administration or not.

The second hypothesis is concerned with teachers' attitudes towards the role of principals in instructional improvement. The authors of a textbook on high school curriculum problems assert: "Our American cultural scene is changing rapidly, so rapidly that much of the curriculum soon becomes out of date unless it is continually revised" (7:89). If the school programs should be revised and improved, and if principals should take the teachers' attitudes and opinions into account when making administrative decisions, then perhaps principals may be interested in data concerning the second hypothesis.

Griffith states, "Teachers expect the administration to actively and aggressively seek to provide better working conditions, including equipment, supplies, and buildings" (8:156). The present study is concerned with investigating whether or not teachers do desire principals to have positive attitudes toward instructional improvement.

The third hypothesis is closely related to the second. It is concerned with the same problem, determining the attitude and the behavior with respect to instructional improvement that teachers expect of principals. However, instead of asking what ought to be done, the questions ask how well the current behavior matches ideal behavior. A different set of standards is operating here, standards that are based on existing conditions, so the results of the third hypothesis can perhaps be interpreted more readily than those of the second hypothesis. In particular, principals may presently be acting ideally. The teachers' conception of an ideal principal may be realized already in their present principal. If so, there is little reason for the principals to alter their behavior.

The fourth hypothesis is prompted by a statement of Griffiths: "They [Teachers] expect him to lead in the development of good community relations, particularly in gaining recognition for the schools . . ." (10:156). If the statement is true, then teachers might want the principal to

gain a position of honor and power in the community. Such a position might help him develop good staff relations. Furthermore, the schools might gain greater recognition from the community by association with the principal. One test of Griffiths' statement is to determine if teachers want their principal to seek the honors of lay society and if they will respect him more if he acts in accordance with these views. The test can be only indicative, not conclusive, since there are many other approaches a principal might use to develop good community relations.

With respect to the fifth hypothesis, it was hoped that some response patterns might be found that might help to classify the teachers. This would provide a principal with more information about the probable attitudes of individual teachers on his staff. Five items in the questionnaire are related to this question. (A complete classification of the items in the questionnaire will be found at the beginning of Chapter III.)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The field of teacher opinion has not been carefully studied. Research workers have not attempted to establish teachers' views on specific aspects of administrative practice. Two areas of research are reviewed here: work that deals specifically with views of administrative practice and theory, and general surveys of teacher opinion.

I. SPECIFIC SURVEYS

Only two studies are in the first category. An investigation by Mark Chesler, Richard Schmuck, and Ronald Lippitt deals with the principal's role in facilitating innovation. Using interviews and rating sheets, the team collected data during the school year 1961-1962 and in the fall of 1962 on the entire staffs of nine Midwestern elementary and secondary schools. They assessed the personal qualities, methods, and interrelations of the teachers and the principals.

The investigation reveals a high correlation between the amount of teacher-initiated innovation and the teachers' perceptions of the principal's innovative spirit (6:274). It also indicates that principals who are sensitive to the teachers' values and skills are associated with innovative

faculties (6:275). No specific recommendations or opinions from teachers are included in the article.

The second study, an analysis by Carolyn Guss and a committee of the Indiana Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, reports teachers' opinions on supervision. Three hundred opinionnaires using open-ended questions were mailed to members of six groups of fifty people each. The groups included administrators, principals, education professors, parents, supervisors, and teachers. One hundred thirty-nine replies were analyzed.

The teachers thought the following four functions were the most important tasks of supervisors:

1. Help teachers, especially new ones, improve classroom instruction.
2. Hold individual conferences with teachers.
3. Provide teacher guidance and improve morale.
4. Serve as leader in curriculum development (9:100).

Item three, which states that supervisors should improve teachers' morale, is the basis for this thesis. The principal should know the extent to which teachers desire individual conferences and the desired relationship between administrator and teachers, among other things, if he is to improve morale and act as an educational leader. The author of the study did not report on these matters beyond providing the list cited above. Six recommendations

included in her article were not concerned with either teacher opinion or supervisory behavior based on teacher attitude.

II. GENERAL SURVEYS

General surveys of teacher opinions have been conducted by the National Education Association. In 1939 the N. E. A. polled 10,000 teachers; 3707 replies were used in tabulating the results (14:226). The report was basically a status study, but many of the questions went beyond this purpose.

The survey included questions requiring essay type answers. Included were the following:

What professional activities and duties do you feel are being neglected because of your present teaching load?

What additional comments or suggestions can you offer regarding aspects of the teacher load situation which impress you as unduly fatiguing, time consuming, or burdensome?

What activities impress you as ineffective routine, mere 'red tape,' or responsibilities that are not properly a part of teacher load?

What next steps do you feel should be taken for better equalization or adjustments of teacher load? (14:269-270).

Although this survey provided administrators with a great deal of valuable information on specific improvements that should be given priority on the innovation schedule, it

did not deal with the role of the administrator in effecting improvements.

In 1945 the N. E. A. conducted a survey entitled "The Teacher Looks at Personnel Administration." This study again combined a status study with a request for opinions (15). The teachers reported the elements in their teaching situations that helped or hindered their teaching. Although the 1945 study provided many ideas for questions used in the questionnaire for the present thesis, the study did not deal specifically with teachers' opinions of administrators' roles in school improvement.

The third important investigation by the N. E. A. was reported in 1951. Only 2200 usable replies were received from 13,500 teachers who were polled (16:5), so the validity of the survey is surely in doubt. As in 1939, the report provided much information on areas needing specific improvement, nothing on the behavior of the ideal administrator.

Three other studies must be mentioned in a survey of teacher opinion research, although only one claims any relevance to a description of the administrator's role. Francis Chase analyzed questionnaires from 1784 teachers (5:127). He did not specify the number of teachers he originally contacted, so the percentage of return and the validity of his results cannot be determined. He supplemented the questionnaire with interviews of 500 teachers. With respect to

administrators he says:

Dynamic and stimulating leadership by the building principal and by the superintendent of schools are both rated as of the highest importance to satisfaction by more than 85 per cent of the respondents who said they had this kind of leadership (5:128).

Later he says:

Stimulating professional leadership from fair and sympathetic administrators and supervisors is one of the most important ingredients in teacher satisfaction. The evidence of the check lists in regard to the importance of professional leadership was strongly reinforced by the interviews. The most important characteristics of professional leadership appear to be vision, courage, integrity, and competence; other qualities highly valued by teachers are friendliness, understanding, and appreciation (5:131).

E. C. Hunter did a study with a scope almost as large as the 1939 and 1951 N. E. A. studies. In 1950 he sent out 1837 questionnaires, one to each public school teacher in New Orleans, receiving 465 replies (11:347). He asked forty-three "yes" or "no" type questions.

Some of the results raise interesting questions that are explored by the present thesis. For example, "Are your general working conditions such as to encourage you to give your best services to classroom teaching?" In 1953, 49 per cent of the teachers said "no" (11:348). Unfortunately, his study cannot tell us why, or how the situation could have been changed. "Does the administration and supervisory staff [sic] assist you and cooperate with you in every way possible in the performance of your duties as a classroom

teacher?" In 1953, 39 per cent said "no," 11 per cent were undecided (11:349). This thesis delves a little bit into the problems that Hunter's data reveals.

The last research report to be considered was described by Louis Kaplan in 1952. He asked 250 elementary teachers to select the items that pertained to them from a check list of 100 items dealing with teacher annoyances. His rate of return was apparently 100 per cent (12:655). As in the N. E. A. studies, many problem areas were identified, but no solutions were recommended. One area of interest involves the fact that 12 per cent of the teachers felt "very disturbed or greatly annoyed" by "principals who exert pressure on teachers to improve the academic accomplishments of the class" (12:657).

III. SUMMARY

The eight surveys considered above are the only important studies available in the literature. Others that might seem pertinent are minor editions of the eight. None of the articles deals definitively with the problem of teachers' perceptions of the administrative role.

CHAPTER III

PLAN OF RESEARCH

The selection of the population and the choice of hypotheses are described in Chapter I. A questionnaire was chosen as the most appropriate instrument for use with the desired population. Interviews or use of Q-sort techniques were rejected on the assumption that formally structured or time-consuming techniques such as these would reduce the fraction of teachers willing to cooperate in the study.

I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The literature of school administration and school personnel management was examined in order to obtain issues pertinent to the hypotheses of the study. Several hundred questions were developed, and forty-seven were finally chosen to be included in the questionnaire. These items were chosen to satisfy two criteria. First, they were to bear upon a hypothesis. Second, even when standing alone, they were to be of interest to a high school principal concerned about the attitudes of his teachers. The questions were not forced into any particular form since to do so might reduce the value of each question so distorted.

The number of questions relevant to each hypothesis had to be restricted. If the entire questionnaire had been

devoted to questions on one hypothesis, the respondents might have become fatigued, answering carelessly or mechanically, or refusing to complete the form. An attempt was made to reduce respondents' fatigue by arranging the questions in the questionnaire in a random order. This was done by assigning each question a number and then placing it in the same order as the numbers from a table of random numbers. This arrangement also limited the associations made between two similar questions and the resulting tendency to answer all similar questions in exactly the same way.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF THE QUESTIONS

The questions are classified below into five groups corresponding to the five hypotheses discussed previously. Each question cited retains its number in the original questionnaire.

Group I, questions dealing with democratic administration, is divided into two subgroups. The names of the subgroups and the question-numbers in each follow.

A. Democratic-autocratic choice: 3, 5, 12, 14, 15, 18, 27, 33.

B. Extent of participation (This group attempts to determine the extent to which members of the school staff should participate in school administration and school

improvement): 4, 19, 29, 30, 45, 46.

Group II includes the questions dealing with teachers' expectations about the principal's positive and negative attitudes. The questions are numbered 10, 13, 20, 21, 24, 36, 39, 40, 41, and 47.

The Group III questions deal with the extent to which principals' current behavior maximizes instructional improvement. Included in this group are questions 25, 28, 34, 43, and 44.

Group IV includes the questions dealing with the influence of the principal's position in society upon his prestige among his faculty members. These are questions 1, 2, 6, 11, 17, 26, and 31.

Group V, questions relating to some general attitudes of teachers, attitudes that may associate with certain response patterns of the teachers, includes questions 7, 9, 22, 35, and 37.

III. THE RESEARCH POPULATION

The director of the Data Processing Center of Central Washington State College provided a list of names and addresses of all the graduate students at the summer session who were twenty-six years of age or younger. Since the list included each student's field of study, some students obviously not part of the desired population (such

as elementary education students) were eliminated from the list. The reduced list was the basis for personal contact with each possible respondent. Where possible, students were contacted in Education classes. Others were contacted by a visit to the Ellensburg home of each student whose name remained on the list. Every member of the target population meeting the following conditions was contacted and received a questionnaire:

1. Registered at Central Washington State College for graduate work during the last week of July, 1966.
2. Living in or near Ellensburg, Washington, at the time.
3. Twenty-six years of age or younger.
4. One to three years of teaching experience.
5. Taught in a senior high school (grades 10 to 12) during the preceding school year, 1965-66.

At the time the survey was taken, only 34 teachers met the conditions specified. The replies of 31 of the 34 are contained in this report. Of the three missing replies, two are probably accounted for by theft from the author's mailbox. After mail from the box had been stolen, one questionnaire and two empty envelopes were found in various places around the building. It is not believed that such a loss would bias the sample, but only reduce the population to 32.

Since an investigation of the extent to which different samples of teachers have common characteristics is a task beyond the scope of this thesis, the problem has been precluded as much as possible by limiting the differences of the population by considering only teachers meeting the five conditions listed above.

IV. ADDITIONAL FACTS ABOUT THE POPULATION

The teachers in the sample were all senior high school teachers, but every level was represented in their background of teaching experience. Ten had one year of teaching experience; 13 had two years, and eight had three years. All had taught the previous year--at schools ranging in size from a seven-teacher staff to one with 75 teachers. Twenty-five men and six women made up the sample. Twenty-eight of the 31 were studying to complete the Fifth Year requirements, and 24 were working on Master's degree programs. Teachers in the sample represented the following departments: Business Education (2); English (9); Foreign Language (1); Home Economics (5); Industrial Arts (2); Mathematics (7); Music (4); Physical Education (4); Science (4); and Social Studies (7).

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

In this chapter each of the five groups of data will be discussed separately.

I. DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDES--GROUP I

Democratic-autocratic choice (Subgroup A). The data for this subgroup are summarized in Table I, page 25. As the table shows, 77 per cent of the teachers believe schools should be administered democratically. Considering the emphasis placed on the democratic way of doing things in conventional teacher education textbooks, the figure is surprisingly low. Sixteen per cent of the teachers answered "no" and six per cent have no opinion. Fifty-eight per cent of the teachers say that every teacher who might be affected by a decision should share in making it, rather than leaving it up to the principal to consider the positions of the teachers and make the decision himself.

Questions 5, 12, 18, and 27 test the strength of the teachers' convictions. Only once do they sacrifice democracy. Adding the results of all six questions, the "democratic" option was chosen by 47 per cent, the "autocratic" option by 42 per cent of the teachers.

TABLE I
 RESPONSES OF TEACHERS TO DEMOCRATIC-AUTOCRATIC
 CHOICE QUESTIONS (GROUP I-A)

Question	Response	Percentage*
3. Teachers expect democratic administration	yes	77
	no	16
	doesn't matter	0
	no opinion	6
5. Teachers prefer democrat (a), dedicated autocrat (b)	a	61
	b	35
12. Teachers prefer democrat (a), innovative autocrat (b)	a	19
	b	68
14. Decision-making: Teachers share (a), advise (b)	a	58
	b	35
15. Teachers' feelings on question 14 (above)	strongly agree a	23
	strongly disagree a	6
	strongly agree b	13
	strongly disagree b	3
	strongly agree both	19
	strongly disagree both	6
18. Planning for new activities: principal (a), teachers (b)	a	26
	b	58
27. Teachers prefer democrat (a), overtime working autocrat (b)	a	39
	b	39
33. Principal should ever require a course of study	yes	32
	no	45
	doesn't matter	6
	no opinion	10

*Percentages are calculated as a fraction of thirty-one, the total number of respondents.

These questions seemed to produce a great deal of conflict and tension. For example, all thirty-one teachers responded to the item before question 27, but 23 per cent refused to make a decision on question 27. One teacher who did not answer the question felt constrained to write "REALLY DON'T KNOW!" Similarly, all the teachers responded to question 17, but only 84 per cent answered question 18. Commenting on the tension produced by these questions, a teacher wrote, "I seem to be contradicting myself on whether a principal should be autocratic or democratic because I believe he should strongly consider the teacher's opinion and then make the final decision himself. He is the boss!"

An examination of questions 14 and 15 further defines the teachers' attitudes. The majority of the teachers believe they should have a share in making decisions that affect them. However, a substantial fraction prefer to leave the decision-making to the principal--with the proviso that he keep their positions in mind while making his decision.

Almost half of the teachers do not care about the decision-making process in the school or strongly disagree with the two democratically oriented processes stated in question 14. But, since people without firm convictions tend to follow the lead of those who feel strongly, and since those who do agree strongly with the democratic

approach greatly outnumber the strongly disagreeing group (55 per cent to 16 per cent), many of the "no strong feeling" teachers would probably align themselves with the majority--democratic--viewpoint.

In order to obtain a response to at least one particular question involving possible administrator-teacher conflict, question 33, "Should a principal ever require a teacher to use a particular course of study?" was included. Thirty-two per cent said "yes," 45 per cent said "no" and 16 per cent said "doesn't matter" or "no opinion." As in questions 14 and 15, about one-half of the teachers oppose an authoritarian approach; many seem to think that such an approach is appropriate, and some do not seem to care one way or another. The population definitely is not speaking with one voice.

Extent of participation (Subgroup B). This subgroup deals with the extent to which teachers want staff members to participate in school administration and program improvement. The data for this subgroup is summarized in Table II, page 28.

A faculty legislature to advise the administration is an obvious and frequently mentioned device for implementing democratic administration of a school. The fact that every teacher responded with an opinion on question 29

TABLE II
 RESPONSES OF TEACHERS TO THE EXTENT OF
 PARTICIPATION QUESTIONS (GROUP I-B)

Question	Response	Percentage*
4. Second year principal may introduce innovations	yes	77
	no	3
	doesn't matter	6
	no opinion	10
19. a. Defend innovations to superintendent: teacher, principal	teacher primarily	3
	principal primarily	23
	both equally	74
b. Defend innovations to general public: teacher, principal	teacher primarily	0
	principal primarily	39
	both equally	61
29. Teachers desire an advisory faculty legislature	yes	48
	no	42
	doesn't matter	10
	no opinion	0
30. Teachers desire a full power faculty legislature	yes	10
	no	77
	doesn't matter	3
	no opinion	10
45. Coaches should participate in instructional improvement programs	yes	81
	no	6
	doesn't matter	3
	no opinion	6
46. Teachers' faculties expect coaches to participate in instructional improvement programs	yes	84
	no	6
	don't know	6

*Percentages are calculated as a fraction of thirty-one, the total number of respondents.

would suggest either that he had thought about the idea before and was prepared to give his considered opinion or that he did not feel threatened by the question. Forty-eight per cent favor establishing an advisory faculty legislature; 42 per cent oppose the idea, and 10 per cent feel it does not matter one way or the other. These results are consistent with the pattern described for the Democratic-Autocratic choice results.

Question 30 (Table II) is of particular interest when compared with question 3 (Table I). The results are almost exactly opposite in the two questions. It seems that teachers do not think of an authoritative (and responsible) faculty legislature as an appropriate part of a democratic administration.

The majority of the teachers believe principals and all faculty members should be involved in improving the school program and in explaining the improvements to the superintendent and to the public. The answers to questions 4, 19, 45, and 46, together with question 12 (Table I) in which 68 per cent of the teachers prefer a principal who "is continually taking the initiative to introduce improvements into the school program," indicate a general desire by the teachers for the participation of both teachers and administrators in instructional improvement.

II. GROUP II: TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS ABOUT PRINCIPALS' ATTITUDES

The next set of data to be examined concerns how teachers feel about the positive and negative attitudes of their principals. The topic is covered in questions 10, 13, 20, 21, 24, 36, 39, 40, 41, and 47, with the results presented in Table III, page 31. The questions are directly related to the second hypothesis of the thesis, about whether or not teachers want principals to have positive attitudes toward instructional improvement.

Before discussing teachers' expectations, it is advisable to see just how important non-positive attitudes can be in affecting teachers' actions. Question 10 asks, "Would you want to talk over with the principal an idea for improving the school if you thought the principal would be opposed to the idea?" Eighty-one per cent of the teachers answered "yes." This shows a remarkable lack of concern for the principal's negative attitude. Their response is not accidental nor is it a result of the phrasing of the question, for question 21 asks, "Would you feel like working up and writing a proposal for a possible instructional improvement if you thought there was a 50-50 chance the principal would look at it seriously?" Eighty-four per cent of the teachers said "yes." Once again, these teachers said definitely that

TABLE III

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS TO TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS ABOUT
PRINCIPALS' ATTITUDES QUESTIONS (GROUP II)

Question	Response	Percentage*
10. Teachers want to talk over ideas, even with a negative principal	yes	81
	no	19
13. Teachers want regularly scheduled meetings with their principals	yes	45
	no	35
	doesn't matter	13
	no opinion	6
20. Principals should delegate all instructional supervision to vice-principals	yes	3
	no	87
	doesn't matter	10
	no opinion	0
21. Teachers will write up a proposal if it has a 50-50 chance to be considered	yes	84
	no	16
24. Formal teacher evaluation tends to reduce teacher innovation	yes	23
	no	32
	doesn't matter	3
	no opinion	42
36. Principals, teachers should initiate discussion of new ideas	principal	48
	teachers	29
37. Teachers expect principals to provide a cultural environment	yes	81
	no	10

TABLE III (Continued)

Question	Response	Percentage*
40. Teachers want to be told how much money is available for experimentation and innovation	yes	58
	no	6
	doesn't matter	16
	no opinion	13
41. Evaluation of a teacher in the midst of innovation is fair	yes, it is fair	58
	no, it is not fair	29
47. Teachers feel free to ask principals for materials to help their programs	yes	90
	no	6
	don't know	0

*Percentages are calculated as a fraction of thirty-one, the total number of respondents.

non-positive administration attitudes would not deter them from seeking to present proposals for improving the school.

One more figure reinforces the last statement.

Question 47 deals with the teachers' willingness to ask for money for their programs. Considering the nature of school budgets, teachers must often expect requests for money to be refused. Yet 90 per cent said they were willing to ask for more funds for their programs. It is unfortunate that six per cent are restrained from asking even when they are sure the money would help their programs, but the 90 per cent who are affirmative constitute a dramatic display of personal confidence.

The effect of formal teacher evaluations as possible inhibiting influences is evaluated in questions 24 and 41. Twenty-three per cent of the teachers believe that standard rating forms hamper innovation; 35 per cent believe they do not, and the rest (42%) have no opinion on the subject. This supervisory device is certainly open to question, but the large proportion of teachers who did not express an opinion greatly reduces the value of the results. Data for question 41 is more complete. Most teachers think it is fair for the principal to rate or evaluate a teacher involved in a major curricular change, but formal evaluation of this sort would tend to antagonize about one-fourth of the faculty. One unusual fact should be noted. Of the teachers who

answered "yes" to question 24, only one marked "no" on question 41. In other words, 48 per cent of the population would feel restricted or antagonized under the conditions of the question. Only three per cent would be both restricted and antagonized. This is not a close critical examination of teacher evaluations, but to a limited extent the use of standard evaluation instruments would seem to be in opposition to teacher opinion.

Five questions provide some information about how much the teachers want specific activities. (1) When asked if responsibilities should be transferred away from principals, the teachers gave the present system a vote of confidence. Eighty-seven per cent of the teachers would rather have the principal involved in curriculum improvement (even though he presently reserves only a part of his time for that responsibility) than have a full-time vice-principal in charge of the curriculum. (2) About half of the teachers approve of regularly scheduled meetings between the principal and each individual teacher. A third would be displeased by such an arrangement. (3) In the answers to question 36 the emphasis is clearly on the principal initiating the contact. However, teachers certainly do not want to be prohibited from beginning the discussion. (4) Most teachers want to know how much money is available before they start working on a project. (5) Question 39 is directed to

finding the degree to which teachers hold principals responsible for providing a stimulating cultural environment. More than 80 per cent of the total population (almost 90 per cent of the teachers responding to the question) affirm that the principal does have a responsibility to provide a stimulating cultural climate for the faculty.

III. GROUP III: THE CURRENT BEHAVIOR OF PRINCIPALS

The third hypothesis is investigated with questions 25, 28, 34, 43, and 44. These seven items were designed to answer the question, do principals presently seem to be working with teachers so as to maximize instructional improvement? The data is presented in Table IV, page 36.

The crucial questions in the series are numbers 43 and 44. As Table IV shows, 65 per cent of the teachers said they did not have any ideas they were not able to try; however, 32 per cent said "yes." The reasons given for "yes" answers include lack of experience, lack of money, lack of time, lack of facilities, the structure of the school day, and obstructionist administrators. Perhaps the aborted ideas of these teachers would harm rather than improve the educational system; no evidence is available to judge that issue. However, the teachers themselves feel convinced, apparently, that the ideas are progressive.

TABLE IV
 RESPONSES OF TEACHERS TO THE PRINCIPALS' CURRENT
 BEHAVIOR QUESTIONS (GROUP III)

Question	Response	Percentage*
25. More sympathy to novel ideas can be expected from faculty committees, principals	faculty committees principals	32 48
Comments:	It would depend on the situation. Teachers would be more receptive, since they are all in a group. Principals are too sensitive to public opinion to be receptive. Principals have to make the final decisions anyway. Principals can be more objective. Teachers might be jealous and overcritical. Principals are very receptive.	
28. Principals generally receive ideas positively, negatively	positively negatively	68 23
34. Principals give teachers the feeling that the school budget is very limited	yes no	26 71
If "yes," teachers believe the budget is that limited	yes no don't know	10 6 10
43. Teachers have innovative ideas they have not been able to try	yes no	32 65

TABLE IV (Continued)

Question	Response	Percentage*
44. If the answer to question 43 is "yes," the ideas have not been tried because:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of time Lack of money Lack of experience or self-confidence School's dedication to <u>status quo</u> Lack of support Lack of facilities Opposition by administration Opposition by public and student opinion Structure of the school day 	

*Percentages are calculated as a fraction of thirty-one, the total number of respondents.

Two questions (28 and 34) deal specifically with how teachers perceive the principals' current attitudes. Sixty-eight per cent believe that principals receive ideas for school improvement positively; 23 per cent see a generally negative reception. Seventy-one per cent of the teachers were given the impression by their principals that funds were available for innovations, but 26 per cent were left with the feeling that money was so limited that it was not worthwhile to talk about any innovations that would cost additional money. The responses to questions 28 and 34 indicate that principals in only a slim majority of cases communicate a positive attitude toward instructional improvement.

The last question to be considered here (25) deals with a possible change in school organization. Forty-eight per cent of the teachers feel a principal provides a more sympathetic and receptive audience for novel ideas than would a faculty committee. Only 32 per cent feel the opposite way. Half again as many teachers rate the principal even higher than other teachers on the quality of sympathetic and receptive listening. The results agree well with the high percentage of principals who communicate a positive attitude toward instructional improvement (question 28).

IV. GROUP IV: THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRINCIPAL'S POSITION IN LAY SOCIETY

The fourth group of questions centers on the problem: "Do teachers value a principal more highly if he has an important position in society outside his school?" The answer involves questions 1, 2, 6, 11, 17, 26, and 31 with the results shown in Table V, page 40. With only minor exceptions the teachers' responses show disinterest in a principal's status outside the school setting. Summing up the results of these seven questions: 14 per cent of the responses are "yes"; 41 per cent are "no," and 40 per cent are "doesn't matter." That is, 14 per cent of the time teachers would be influenced by circumstances that increase the principal's prestige in lay society. Eighty-one per cent of the time they would not be influenced.

It may be noted that one-fourth of the teachers gave two-thirds of the "yes" answers. However, no teacher answered "yes" more than three times out of the seven opportunities, and only 13 per cent of the teachers had as many as three "yes" answers. Forty-two per cent of the teachers did not respond "yes" even once, leaving 58 per cent who did respond "yes" one or more times. In short, most teachers are influenced a little bit by a principal's social standing; very few are influenced very much.

TABLE V
 RESPONSES OF TEACHERS TO THE INFLUENCE OF
 OUTSIDE HONORS QUESTIONS (GROUP IV)

Question	Response	Percentage*
1. Teachers expect principals to be community leaders	yes	19
	no	32
	doesn't matter	48
	no opinion	0
2. Teachers respect a principal more if he is a community leader	yes	6
	no	42
	doesn't matter	42
	no opinion	10
6. Teachers respect a principal more if he is prominent in state politics	yes	19
	no	48
	doesn't matter	26
	no opinion	6
11. Teachers respect a principal more if he is an officer in his principals' association	yes	13
	no	32
	doesn't matter	48
	no opinion	6
17. Teachers respect a principal more if he occupies an important church office	yes	10
	no	45
	doesn't matter	42
	no opinion	3
26. Teachers respect a principal more if he has written articles for education journals	yes	19
	no	45
	doesn't matter	32
	no opinion	3
31. Teachers are more willing to try an innovation if the principal has published an article about it	yes	10
	no	45
	doesn't matter	42
	no opinion	3

*Percentages are calculated as a fraction of thirty-one, the total number of respondents.

V. GROUP V: GENERAL ATTITUDES

The final group of questions samples the teachers' general attitudes. The data for these questions is summarized in Table VII, page 42. The teachers rank their schools from "excellent" to "very poor." Fifty-eight per cent of the districts were considered to be above average, while 23 per cent were ranked below average. The median falls in the "slightly above average" class. Teachers seem to be a little prouder of their districts than objective analysis of a random sample would permit.

They believe, in the ratio of 55 to 29 per cent, that general philosophical grounds should predominate over technical knowledge when school policy is formed. And they have a considerable degree of confidence in the value of specialized professional training for school administrators. Thirty-five per cent tend to respect a principal more highly if he received his Master's degree in educational administration. Thirteen per cent prefer a man with an academic degree. (Forty-eight per cent chose the "neutral" response.)

Question 35, unfortunately, adds little information. It was left blank by 39 per cent and seemed to confuse many of those who did answer. The question asks how teachers could be held responsible for increased authority. The relevant replies seem to form two groups. One group centers

TABLE VI
 RESPONSES OF TEACHERS TO THE GENERAL ATTITUDES
 QUESTIONS (GROUP V)

Question	Response	Percentage*
7. The quality of the teacher's school system was:	excellent	6
	well above average	19
	slightly above average	32
	average	19
	slightly below average	6
	well below average	13
	very poor	3
9. School policies should be made on the basis of technical knowledge, general philosophy	technical knowledge	29
	general philosophy	55
22. Teachers respect a principal more if his Master's degree is in an academic area, administration	academic discipline	13
	educational administration	35
	neutral	48
35. Teachers who are given authority can be held responsible for their actions in this way:	progress reports required	
	teachers execute policy	
	teachers defend policies to the public	
	teachers check each other	
	teachers should not be asked to accept authority	
	checks on teachers are unnecessary	
	A faculty cannot be held responsible, so it should not be given authority	
	"I don't know"	
37. Principals should provide the following types of recognition for high quality teaching:	private, personal commendation	
	praise at a faculty meeting	
	extra pay	
	more freedom to try new ideas	
	a voice in setting policy	
	Teaching is its own reward	
	"I don't know"	

*Percentages are calculated as a fraction of thirty-one, the total number of respondents.

on the idea that teachers should execute their own policy, with the unstated assumption that the execution of bad policy is a punishing task. The other set of comments says that teachers cannot be held responsible, adding that principals should therefore keep their policy making power. The free responses to question 35 do not affect any of the other interpretations offered in this chapter.

The last question to be considered, number 37, asks for ways to reward teachers for high quality teaching. The replies were scattered, perhaps because of disinterest, perhaps because the teachers feel they have no new ideas to contribute. Four main approaches were cited: (1) private gestures of appreciation by the principal, (2) public recognition at faculty meetings or banquets, (3) merit pay, and (4) "Good teaching is its own reward." Group recognition was noted, but seemed to be the least significant form of reward. The teachers generally wanted society's official representative to confirm the fact that they had done something important for education.

In summary, no interesting associations were found between the responses to any of the general attitude questions and any of the other questions in the questionnaire.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The data discussed in Chapter IV seem to indicate that a majority of the teachers believe in democratic school administration (as they conceive the word "democratic"); however, a sizable minority does not. Furthermore, only a very small fraction of the sample favors democratic administration when it thinks autocratic administration can do a better job.

The results of the second set of questions (Group I-B) support the view that the teachers want every member of the staff to participate in improving the school, but they are not interested in a formal faculty legislature that would act as the policy making body of the school. The population seems to separate the functions of maintaining and improving the schools. These teachers want the principal to do his job of maintaining the school and want everyone to participate in improving the school.

With respect to the second hypothesis, the responses suggest that most teachers want the principal to continue to have primary responsibility for instructional supervision; they want regular communication with him; they feel it is his obligation to initiate the process; they want access to the information that is likely to affect policy decisions

that affect them; and they want the principal to provide a vital cultural environment.

The expectations that the teachers have of their principals can be summed up: the teachers hope that the principals will initiate a process of discovering and implementing new ideas. The results discussed above, combined with the answers to questions 5 and 12 shown in Table I (which indicate a preference for administrators dedicated to high standards and striving to initiate new ideas to improve the school program, even if these administrators are not "democratic"), indicate that teachers do want principals to have positive attitudes toward instructional improvement.

The responses to the questions examined in Group III were mixed. Principals seem to be highly regarded in some respects, but to a large minority of teachers there are problems. These teachers say they have ideas they cannot try. Many principals are perceived as being hostile to new ideas. Many discourage teachers by stressing the limitations of the school budget. Although the evidence does not lead to the conclusion that administrators prevent schools from benefitting from innovation, it does suggest that the maximum benefits possible probably have not been realized because administrators are insensitive to or ignorant of the feelings of some groups of teachers.

With respect to the fourth hypothesis, in only 14 per cent of the responses did the teacher indicate that they were interested in the principal's position in society. Eighty-one per cent of the responses indicated that the teachers do not expect or desire the principal to gain prominence in lay society. Most of the teachers would be interested occasionally; few would ever care very much.

The items of the questionnaire that pertained to the general attitudes of the teachers contributed virtually no information. No particular patterns appeared to be associated with teachers who were proud or disappointed in their school districts, nor with those who might be termed philosophers or technicians, nor with academists or educationists. The free response question produced few comments, and these had little uniformity of content.

The interpretations discussed above are limited, of course, to the teachers who participated in the study. The limitations of the study were explained in Chapter I where it was noted that the research population was small, only thirty-one people, and was not a random sample of the young, experienced high school teachers of the state. However, the population did include almost all the people in that classification at the college. When the data are considered, it should also be remembered that the questionnaire has not been standardized on any other population. The results of

the study should be examined with the specific questions of the questionnaire kept in mind.

The whole purpose of this thesis is based on the view that an administrator's actions should generally be congruent with teachers' expectations. If the progress of the school requires that he act in opposition to the present attitudes of the teachers, he must exert himself to know and then to change those attitudes so that they will be congruent with his actions. It is hoped that the material presented in this thesis may serve to increase the congruence of administrators' actions and teachers' attitudes and to reduce organizational friction that impedes our educational system in its progress to the highest possible level of quality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arnold, Dwight S. "Morale as Influenced by Participation in Group Planning and Action," Educational Research Bulletin, 32:202-211, November 11, 1953.
2. Becker, Howard S. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," Journal of Educational Sociology, 27:128-141, November, 1953.
3. Bidwell, Charles E. "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching," Journal of Educational Sociology, 29:41-47, September, 1955.
4. Blumberg, Arthur, and Edmund Amidon. "A Comparison of Teacher and Principal Attitudes Toward Faculty Meetings," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 48:45-55, March, 1964.
5. Chase, Francis S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," The Phi Delta Kappan, 33:127-132, November, 1951.
6. Chesler, Mark, and Richard Schmuck and Ronald Lippitt. "The Principal's Role in Facilitating Innovation," Theory into Practice, 2:269-271-, December, 1963.
7. Clark, Leonard H. and Raymond L. Klein and John B. Burks. The American Secondary School Curriculum. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.
8. Griffiths, Daniel E. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956. 458 pp.
9. Guss, Carolyn. "How is Supervision Perceived," Educational Leadership, 19:99-102, November, 1961.
10. Hedlund, Paul A., and Foster S. Brown. "Conditions that Lower Teacher Morale," The Nation's Schools, 48:40-42, September, 1951.
11. Hunter, E. C. "Attitudes and Professional Relationships of Teachers: A Study of Teacher Morale," Journal of Experimental Education, 23:345-352, June, 1955.

12. Kaplan, Louis. "The Annoyances of Elementary School Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, 45:649-665, May, 1952.
13. Miller, Robert S. "Educators' Attitudes Toward Educational Practices," Journal of Educational Research, 56:424-427, April, 1963.
14. National Education Association Research Bulletin. "The Teacher Looks at Teacher Load," 17:221-270, November, 1939.
15. National Education Association Research Bulletin. "The Teacher Looks at Personnel Administration," 23:93-147, December, 1945.
16. National Education Association Research Bulletin. "Teaching Load in 1950," 29:1-51, February, 1951.
17. Rasmussen, Glen R. "Perceived Value Discrepancies of Teachers and Principals--A Threat to Creative Teaching," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 46:1-12, March, 1962.
18. Wall, Bartholomew D. "Some Attitudinal Differences Among Educational Specialists, Administrators and Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, 53:115-117, November, 1959.
19. Van Dalen, Deobold B. and William J. Meyer. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962. 432 pp.
20. Van Zwoll, James A. School Personnel Supervision. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1964. 470 pp.

APPENDIX

The Teacher's Perception of the Principal and His Role

Please do NOT put your name on this paper. To protect you further, each individual questionnaire will be held in strictest confidence. There are no "wrong" answers; please express your real feelings.

Please answer the following questions by CIRCLING the appropriate answer(s) or by writing in the space provided.

- A. Level of teaching experience (K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,
7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)
- B. Number of years of teaching experience (0, 1, 2, 3,
more than 3)
- C. Did you teach full time last year, 1965-66? (yes, no)
If "yes" about how many teachers were in your building? _____
- D. Age (26 or under, over 26)
- E. Sex (male, female)
- F. Are you working on a Master's degree? (yes, no)
- G. Are you completing your Fifth Year requirements? (yes, no)
- H. In what department did you teach last year?

Self-contained
Mathematics
English
Vocational Trades
Foreign Languages
Music
Library
Physical Education

Science
Social Studies
Industrial Arts
Home Economics
Counseling
Art
Other (please specify _____)

The Teacher's Perception of the Principal and His Role

1. Do you expect your principal to be a community leader (such as a town councilman or chairman for the community chest drive)?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
2. Would you respect him and follow his lead in matters of educational change more willingly if he were a community leader?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
3. Do you believe a principal should administer his school democratically?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
4. Do you feel it is appropriate for a principal to attempt to introduce important changes into the school program after one year as principal of the building?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
5. Would you rather teach in a school with a principal who
 - a. administers the school democratically, enthusiastically supports the educational views of his teachers, and allows each teacher to have his own standards for the amount of effort and the quality of teaching that is appropriate.
OR
 - b. administers the school autocratically, is dedicated to a high ideal of education, and expects from himself and all the staff high standards of effort and of quality.
a. b.
6. Would you respect a principal more if he were prominent in state politics?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
7. Do you think the quality of the school system in which you taught last year was
Excellent, well above average, slightly above average, average, slightly below average, well below average, very poor
8. a. Should the principal specify a philosophy of education for the school
OR
b. should the teachers develop one cooperatively
OR
c. should each teacher be allowed to operate under his own philosophy?
a. b. c.
9. Should school policies be made on the basis of technical knowledge or on general philosophical grounds?
Technical knowledge General philosophy

10. Would you want to talk over with the principal an idea for improving the school if you thought the principal would be opposed to the idea?
yes no
11. Would you respect a principal more and follow his lead more willingly if he were a prominent officer in his principals' association?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
12. Would you rather teach in a school with a principal who
- a. administers the school quite democratically and for his own part wants to maintain the status quo in a smooth running school
OR
b. administers the school autocratically and is continually taking the initiative to introduce improvements into the school program.
a. b.
13. Would you favor the idea of regularly scheduled meetings between the principal and each individual teacher, say for a half hour session once every three weeks?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
14. Which of these statements do you agree with more?
- a. "Every teacher who might be affected by a decision should share in making it."
b. "Since he will be held responsible for the decision, the principal should take into account the thinking, personalities, capabilities and responsibility of the teachers affected and make the decision himself."
a. b.
15. Do you feel strongly about either of the two statements above?
strongly agree a. strongly disagree a. no strong feelings.
strongly agree b. strongly disagree b.
strongly agree both. strongly disagree both.
16. Do you think your faculty last year could formulate educational policy that would be as good as that determined by your principal?
yes no don't know
17. Would you respect a principal more if he occupied an important position in a church than if he did not belong to any religious group?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
18. Would you rather teach in a school with a principal who
- a. develops by himself a well-organized plan for every new activity in the school
OR
b. relies on teachers to develop plans for new activities as much as they see fit?
a. b.

19. a. Should the teacher involved, or the principal or both be expected to defend a controversial change in the instructional program to the superintendent?
 teacher primarily principal primarily both equally
- b. Who should be expected to defend the measure to the general public?
 teacher primarily principal primarily both equally
20. Should the principal stop all his efforts to improve instruction and appoint a vice-principal whose sole duty would be to maintain and improve the instructional program?
 yes no doesn't matter no opinion
21. Would you feel like working up and writing up a proposal for a possible instructional improvement if you thought there was a 50-50 chance the principal would look at it seriously?
 yes no
22. Would you respect more a principal with a Master's degree in an academic discipline or a principal with one in educational administration?
 academic discipline educational administration neutral
23. Do you like to participate in school improvements with a groups of teachers or would you rather work on your own?
 work with group work on my own
24. Does formal teacher evaluation on standard forms tend to reduce innovation by the teachers?
 yes no doesn't matter no opinion
25. If you had a novel idea for improving the school would you feel you could find a more sympathetic and receptive audience for the idea from a faculty committee or from a principal?
 faculty committee
 principal

Any Comments?

26. Would you tend to respect a principal more if he had written articles for education journals than if he had not?
 yes no doesn't matter no opinion

27. Would you rather teach in a school with a principal who
 a. administers the school democratically and sees to it that he works no more than forty hours a week
 OR
 b. administers the school autocratically and is willing to work at his duties sixty or seventy hours a week?
 a. b.

28. Based on your experience, do principals generally receive ideas from teachers on improvement of the school positively or negatively?
 positively negatively

29. Do you think the school should establish a faculty legislature to make recommendations to the principal concerning school policies within the building?
 yes no doesn't matter no opinion

30. Should it establish a faculty legislature with full power to establish building policy?
 yes no doesn't matter no opinion

31. Would you be more willing to try an instructional change desired by the principal if he had written about it in an education journal?
 yes no doesn't matter no opinion

32. Should an instructional improvement in your department be of interest to other departments, justifying a presentation of the innovation at a faculty meeting?
 yes no doesn't matter no opinion

33. Should a principal ever require a teacher to use a particular course of study?
 yes no doesn't matter no opinion

34. Did your principal leave you with the feeling that the school budget was just too limited to make it worthwhile for you to talk about innovations that would cost money.
 yes no

If "yes" do you believe that the school budget was really that limited?
 yes no don't know

35. Assuming that responsibility should accompany authority, how could teachers who are given some authority to collectively determine school policy be held responsible for their actions?

36. Should the principal go to the teachers to ask them for their ideas on possible improvements in the school program or should he expect the teachers to come to him with their ideas?
 principal go to teachers teachers come to principal

37. What types of recognition for high quality teaching should the principal act to provide?
38. If you received substantial recognition for your instructional innovations, would the other teachers in your building sincerely congratulate you or would they be jealous?
sincerely congratulate be jealous
39. Should the principal have any responsibility for bringing cultural events into the school for the stimulation of the teachers?
yes no
40. Before you start working on an innovation, should the principal tell you just how much money is available to the school for experimentation?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
41. Do you think it is fair for a principal to rate or evaluate you as a teacher while you are engaged in a major change in the instructional process, e.g., in the first year of introducing a new course into the curriculum?
yes, it is fair
no, it is not fair
42. Should the principal actively seek to defend you against encroachments upon your privileges by other teachers?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
43. Do you have any ideas for better teaching that you would like to try but feel you do not have the opportunity to try?
yes no

IF "YES"

44. ^ What keeps you from trying them?
45. Should the principal expect coaches and others who are heavily involved in extra-curricular activities to participate in instructional improvement programs?
yes no doesn't matter no opinion
46. Do you think your fellow faculty members expect participation by these people?
yes no don't know
47. Would you feel completely free to ask your principal for an extra hundred dollars worth of materials if you thought they would be sure to help your program?
yes no don't know

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COOPERATING IN FILLING OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.